IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Marvin L. Williams

Serial No.:

09/234,351

Filed:

January 20, 1999

Title:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIPS

BETWEEN HYPERTEXT REFERENCES AND ELECTRONIC MAIL

PROGRAM INCORPORATING THE SAME

Grp./A.U.:

2176

Examiner:

Nguyen, M.

Mail Stop 16
Director of the US Patent and
Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an ervelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313, on

8/23/04 (Date)

(Printed or typed name of person signing the certificate

Della Demy

Sir:

PETITION AND REQUEST FOR REFUND

The Applicants received an Advisory Action dated July 14, 2004 stating that Applicant's June 1, 2004 reply to a January 2, 2004 final rejection failed to place the Application in condition for allowance. This Advisory Action was received more that six months after the January 2, 2004 mailing date of the final rejection and, inasmuch as the Applicant's reply failed to place the Application in condition for allowance, the application became abandoned as a matter of law (although as of this date a Notice of Abandonment has not yet been received by the Applicant from the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)). Contemporaneously herewith, the

Applicant is filing a Petition for Revival of an Application Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 CFR 1.137(b) and paying a petition fee of \$1,300.00. The Applicant is respectfully requesting a refund of the \$1,300.00 petition fee for reasons hereinafter set forth.

The Final Rejection of the above referenced application was mailed to the Applicant on January 2, 2004. In accordance with its standard procedure, counsel to Applicant filed a Request for Reconsideration Under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.116 within two months of the mailing date of the Final Rejection, which request was filed by facsimile on March 1, 2004, which is within the two month period of the January 2, 2004 mailing date of the Final Rejection. A copy of the firm's facsimile confirmation receipt is attached hereto. It is the policy of Applicant's counsel to file responses to final rejections within two months of the date of mailing of any such rejection. This is done so that the Examiner can issue an Advisory Action within thirty days of receipt of the response and a Request for Continued Examination or a Notice of Appeal can be filed if the application is not placed in condition for allowance. This policy has worked well to avoid unintentional abandonments.

Inasmuch as an Advisory Action or a Notice of Allowance was not received from the Examiner by June 1, 2004, Debbie Sams, an employee of this firm, checked the filing status of the Request for Reconsideration using the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system and found it had not been recorded. Ms. Sams immediately called the Examiner, who confirmed the Request for Reconsideration had not been recorded and suggested that another facsimile copy be sent to the USPTO, which was done on June 1, 2004. Copies of the facsimile confirmation receipts are attached hereto. On July 6, 2004 the Request for Reconsideration was forwarded to the Examiner for review. Because the USPTO had lost or misplaced the initial filing and because no extension

fees were charged to the Applicant, it was assumed that the Request for Reconsideration would be

given priority and that an Advisory Action would be issued forthwith if a determination was made

that the Applicant's reply had not placed the application in condition for allowance. Instead, the

Applicant received an Advisory Action subsequent to the expiration of the six month period

following the date of mailing of the Final Rejection, which Advisory Action informed the Applicant

that the application had not been placed in condition for allowance. It was now to late to file a

Request for Continued Examination or a Notice of Appeal in order to prevent the application from

becoming abandoned.

Because Applicant's counsel has procedures in place to prevent an application from

becoming abandoned if a reply to a Final Rejection does not place an application in condition for

allowance, which procedure was circumvented because the USPTO lost or misplaced the Applicant's

timely filed Request for Reconsideration in response to the Final Rejection, request is hereby made,

in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.26, that the Petition Fee of \$1,330.00 paid to revive the above-

referenced application be refunded to Hitt Gaines, PC at the address set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.

Date:

D O Boy 830870

P.O. Box 839370

Richardson, Texas 75083

(972) 480-8800

Reg No. 38,914

-3-



MESSAGE CONFIRMATION

03/01/2004 14:40 ID=HITT GAINES, PC

DATE

S,R-TIME

DISTANT STATION ID

MODE

PAGES

RESULT

03/01

01'30"

USPTO

CALLING

006

OK

0000

D001

8378172004

14:38

HITT GAINES, PC → 17038729306

NO.927

HITT GAINES, P.C.

Intellectual Property Law & Related Matters

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO:

Nguyen, M.

Group Art Unit 2176

FAX NO.

(703) 872-9306

FROM:

Jimmy L. Heisz

Hitt Gaines, P.C.

RE:

Serial No. 09/234,351

Attorney Docket No.: M. WILLIAMS 2

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R.§ 1.116

DATE:

March 1, 2004

PAGES:

6 (including cover page)

If you do not receive the indicated number of pages, please notify the sender at the telephone number shown below. Thank you.

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission

TO:

Fax Sender at 972 480 8865

Fax Information

Date Received: Total Pages:

6/1/2004 11:42:20 AM [Eastern Daylight Time]

8 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seg.

Received Cover Page

=====>

06/01/2004 HITT GAINES. PC + USPTO

NO.528 9991

HITT GAINES, P.C.

Intellectual Property Law & Related Matters

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO:

NGUYEN, M. Group Art Unit 2176

FAX NO.

703-872-9306

Jimmy L. Heisz

FROM: RE:

Serial No.: 09/234,351

Attorney Docket No.: WILLIAMS 2

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

DATE:

June 1, 2004

PAGES:

8 (including cover page)

If you do not receive the indicated number of pages, please notify the sender at the telephone number shown below. Thank you.

THE DIFFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACILITIES TRANSMISSION IS AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION INTERRIDED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF THE INTERRIDED RECIPIENT NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE NOTTHERD RECIPIENT, OR ARE NOT THE ORDITORISE OR DELIVERANT HIS TRANSMISSION OF THE INTERRIDE PRODUCTION, YOU ARE HEREBY HOUTHED THAT ANY DISSIMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR CONTINUO OF THEIR TRANSMISSION STRICTLY PRODUCTION. THE ADMINISTRANSMISSION OF STRICTLY PRODUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRANSMISSION OF THE ADDRESS BELOW. WE WILL EXPONENT ADMINISTRANSMISSION OF THE ADDRESS BELOW.

MESSAGE:

Mulling Address: P.O. Bos 832577, Richardson, Texas 75083-2576 rost Address: Pallisade Central II, 1433 North Central Expressivay, Suite 1309, Richardson, Texas 75084-2753 U.S.A. Tdt; (772) 460,4200 Fax: (972) 483-455 first@htmplane.com

PAGE 18 * RCVD AT 6/1/2004 11:42:20 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSi3:972 480 8865 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-18